



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,115	12/23/2004	Renaud Dore	PF020081	9384
24498	7590	11/24/2008	EXAMINER	
Joseph J. Laks			MILLER, BRANDON J	
Thomson Licensing LLC			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2 Independence Way, Patent Operations				2617
PO Box 5312				
PRINCETON, NJ 08543				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/24/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/519,115	DORE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRANDON J. MILLER	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 December 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3.) Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment/Remarks

Disposition of Claims

I. Claims 1-5 remain pending in the application.

Specification

II. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The language of amended claims 4-5, regarding “a program” and “program means”, does not correspond to the language in the specification as originally filed. The page (3) of the specification regarding the above limitation does not recite “a program” and “program means”, but instead uses the limitation “code ...being stored in a memory”.

The following art rejection is based on the best possible interpretation of the claim language in light of the objections under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

III. Claims 1-2 and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the associated terminal" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because the claim does not earlier mention an associated terminal.

Claim 1 recites "wireless terminal" in line 2; "wireless terminals" in line 3; "associated terminal" in line 4 and "terminal" in lines 5 and 6-7. It is unclear from this claim language whether the "wireless terminal"; "wireless terminals"; "associated terminal" and "terminal" are the same or whether they are separate and distinct. The limitation renders the claim indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites "it includes" in line 4. It is unclear what "it" refers to within the context of the language that precedes the limitation in lines 1-4. The limitation renders the claim indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 recite limitations similar to the ones described in claim 1 above and is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph given the same reasoning as recited above.

Claim 4 recites "program means to perform initiation of a procedure for creating a new network" in lines 4-5. It is unclear how the phrase "program means" relates to initiation of the procedure for creating a new network. The limitation renders the claim indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 recites "wireless terminal" in line 1; "which terminal" in line 2 and "terminal" in lines 3-4. It is unclear from this claim language whether the "wireless terminal"; "which

terminal”; and “terminal” are the same or whether they are separate and distinct. The limitation renders the claim indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5 recite limitations similar to the ones described in claim 4 above and is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph given the same reasoning as recited above.

The following art rejection is based upon the best possible interpretation of the claim language in light of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

IV. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1,148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

V. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipasti et al. (US 2002/0039357 A1) in view of Cromer et al. (US 7,146,433 B2).

Regarding claim 1 Lipasti teaches a method of creation of a new communication network by a wireless terminal (see paragraph [0023], establishing pico network reads on new creation of new communication network). Lipasti teaches wherein the wireless terminal initially being part of an existing centralized network that includes an access point (see paragraph [0023], LAN or WLAN reads on existing centralized network). Lipasti teaches initiation of a procedure for creating a new network including a declaration of the terminal as access point of the new network (see paragraph [0023], establishing pico network reads on initiation of procedure for creating new network and device initiating the connection reads declaration of the terminal as access point of the new network because the initiating device becomes master device controlling access to the new network). Lipasti teaches where the operating parameters of the new network are such that communications on the new network do not interfere with the existing network (see paragraph [0023] and Fig. 1). Lipasti does not specifically teach an access point controlling association of a wireless terminal to a network and disassociation of the terminal from the existing centralized network. Cromer teaches an access point controlling association of wireless

terminal to a network and disassociation of the terminal from the existing centralized network (see col. 19, lines 18-24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device in Lipasti adapt to include the access point controlling association of a wireless terminal to a network and disassociation of the terminal from the existing centralized network because it is well known that access points such as the ones described in Lipasti can control association and disassociation of mobile nodes to networks as taught in Cromer.

Regarding claim 2 Lipasit and Cromer teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for initiating disassociation in at least one of the following cases: frequency change rejection by the access point of the existing network following a request for frequency change from the terminal; or connection establishment rejection by the access point of the existing network following a request for connection establishment from the terminal. Cromer does teach initiating disassociation in at least one of a plurality of cases (see col. 2, lines 50-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the invention adapt to include initiating disassociation in at least one of the following cases: frequency change rejection by the access point of the existing network following a request for frequency change from the terminal; or connection establishment rejection by the access point of the existing network following a request for connection establishment from the terminal because Cromer teaches initiating disassociation for a number of other reasons (see Cromer, col. 2, lines 50-56).

Regarding claim 3 Norman teaches wherein the access point of the existing network initiates the disassociation (see col. 4, lines 18-22).

Regarding claim 4 Lipasti teaches a wireless terminal including an interfaces with a communication medium, a microprocessor, and a memory (see paragraph [0023] & [0024]). Lipasti teaches initiation of a procedure for creating a new network including a declaration of the terminal as access point of the new network (see paragraph [0023], establishing pico network reads on initiation of procedure for creating new network and device initiating the connection reads declaration of the terminal as access point of the new network because the initiating device becomes master device controlling access to the new network). Lipasti teaches where the operating parameters of the new network are such that communications on the new network do not interfere with the existing network (see paragraph [0023] and Fig. 1). Lipasti does not specifically teach performing disassociation of the terminal from a network. Cromer teaches performing disassociation of the terminal from a network (see col. 2, lines 50-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device in Lipasti adapt to include performing disassociation of the terminal from a network because it is well known that access points such as the ones described in Lipasti can control association and disassociation of mobile nodes to networks as taught in Cromer.

Regarding claim 5 Lipasti and Cromer teach a device as recited in claim 2 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Response to Arguments

VI. Applicant's arguments filed 7/21/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1-5 the combination of Lipasti and Cromer teach a device as claimed.

Lipasti teaches a method of creation of a new communication network by a wireless terminal (see paragraph [0023]). Establishing pico network reads on creation of new communication network. Lipasti teaches wherein the wireless terminal initially being part of an existing centralized network that includes an access point (see paragraph [0023]). LAN or WLAN reads on existing centralized network. Lipasti teaches initiation of a procedure for creating a new network including a declaration of the terminal as access point of the new network (see paragraph [0023]). Establishing pico network reads on initiation of procedure for creating new network and device initiating the connection reads declaration of the terminal as access point of the new network because the initiating device becomes master device controlling access to the new network. Lipasti teaches where the operating parameters of the new network are such that communications on the new network do not interfere with the existing network (see paragraph [0023] and Fig. 1). Fig. 1 shows new pico networks operating along with existing network and indicates that the created pico network and existing network do not interfere with one another. Cromer is being combined with Lipasti to show that an access point can control association of wireless terminal to a network and disassociation of the terminal from the existing centralized network (see Cromer, col. 19, lines 18-24).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

VII. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON J. MILLER whose telephone number is (571)272-7869. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

November 14, 2008

/Brandon J Miller/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617